

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program* *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013*

---

<b>Applicant</b>	Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$2,611,851
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Las Vegas and San Pedro Creeks Union Pacific Railroad Bridge Replacement Project	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$5,223,793

---

#### PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located in Goleta Valley, in the Cities of Goleta and Santa Barbara. The project will replace two railroad bridge crossings at Las Vegas and San Pedro Creeks. Currently the bridge crossings constrict the two creeks peak flow capacities to 1 in 10 year storm events. The creek beds/crossings will be widened to allow for flows resulting from 1 in 25 year storm events. This will result in reduction of flooding of residential areas and businesses upstream of the improvement. In addition to widening the crossing, the concrete bottom of one crossing will be removed, a concrete structure that inhibits fish passage will be removed, and the creek will be reshaped to provide better fish habitat. Project goals are: 1) reduce flood damage by increasing creek capacity, 2) improve natural habitat, and 3) improve public safety.

The project is part of a multi-phase flood control plan (Phases A, B, and C). Phase A will improve creek capacity at the Highway 101 crossing. Phase B is the proposed project. Phase C will build a flood wall between the creek and the Santa Barbara Airport to provide additional flood protection to mitigate increased flow capacity created by phases A and B.

#### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	18/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	4/10
<b>Total Score (max. possible = 80)</b>			<b>48</b>

#### EVALUATION SUMMARY

##### WORK PLAN

The work plan criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The work plan does not describe all components of the proposed project with sufficient detail. The tasks are not fully

explained or detailed enough to document the work required to complete the project. For example: the project includes creek and riparian habitat restoration (page 3-7), removal of a fish passage barrier, and reshaping the stream bed; the actual work that will be done to make those changes is vaguely described in the work plan. In addition, aside from quarterly reporting and the final report, there are no additional deliverables identified in the proposal. Although the development of the data management is included, it lacks the specificity per the standards.

## **BUDGET**

The budget includes detailed cost information but not all costs can be determined to be reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for many line items presented in the budget. The project costs associated with permitting and habitat restoration are not provided; therefore, the total project cost and 50% match aren't correctly reflected in the application. There is no documentation to clarify how lump sum costs included in the budget are derived. The budget identifies additional items which are not included in the work plan.

## **SCHEDULE**

The tasks outlined in the schedule are consistent with the work plan and budget, and the proposal demonstrates readiness to proceed by October 2014. The proposal states that construction will begin in February 2014. The project is at a 60 percent design level. Construction will be completed in one construction cycle.

## **MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are insufficient. Table 6.1 doesn't address all the benefits listed in Table 3.2. The applicant generally provides measurable targets but some of the measurement tools appear to be inappropriate or are poorly explained. This is particularly apparent for the goal of improving natural habitat.

## **TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION**

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve most claimed benefits but lacks some documentation and not all physical benefits are adequately described. Although a water quality benefit is claimed in the work plan, no information was presented in this attachment to document the water quality benefits. The benefit justification for the change in expected annual stormwater discharge treated by Goleta Sewer System is too generalized. With the project, during events larger than 25 year flood event, there would still be treated discharge. It is not clear from the proposal whether the habitat restoration claimed in the proposal is merely mitigation for the overall project or if additional habitat will be created.

## **BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS**

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Total project cost is shown as \$5.65 million in net present value (NPV).

Proposal uses FRAM to assess flood damage reduction (FDR) benefits for the two bridge replacements. It is unclear if the evaluation of without-project flooded area already accounts for the road culverts being improved to 1 in 25. This is important, because the road culverts could restrict stream flow regardless of the RR bridge improvements. All data inputs could not be verified; using the benefit summary in Table 8-7, reviewer's calculated expected annual damage (EAD)

was somewhat smaller than reported in the proposal. The residential damages from flood events shown in Table 8-7 appear to be large for the relatively small number of affected structures, but insufficient data is provided for the reviewer to check calculations. In particular, the assumptions for residential replacement cost, content values, and foundation height were not provided.

## **PROGRAM PREFERENCES**

Applicant claims that 4 program preferences and 3 statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates this with a high degree of certainty, and adequately documents the magnitude and breadth to which each will be achieved for only 4 of the preferences claimed. The proposal will achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region; 3) Expand Environmental Stewardship; and 4) Practice Integrated Flood Management.